

Executive Committee of the M.I.T. Board of Trustees.

And despite her heavy responsibilities, Dr. Jackson puts aside time to help recruit more women and more African-Americans to the sciences.

Dr. Jackson has always blended her advanced scientific research with an eye toward practicality. She has researched subjects as esoteric as the electronic and optical properties of strained layer semiconductor superlattices. But she has also worked toward basic goals that you and I can understand—like economic development in the State of New Jersey.

I understand that President Clinton has said he would like Dr. Jackson to head the NRC after her confirmation and I enthusiastically support that decision.

I am confident that her scientific and management backgrounds have been ideal preparation for that leadership position.

Mr. President, I believe that Dr. Jackson's background has made her a unique, unparalleled nominee for this position. I urge my colleagues to vote for in support of this excellent nomination, and I yield the floor.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the committees have between 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. on Tuesday, April 18, to file legislative or executive reported items.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCIS-SIONS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on H.R. 889 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of April 6, 1995.)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to strongly urge the Senate to adopt today the conference report on H.R. 889, the emergency Defense supplemental appropriations bill.

On Wednesday, the conferees completed work on this bill, which will ensure that the readiness, quality of life and pay for our Armed Forces will not be impacted by the costs of overseas peacekeeping and humanitarian missions.

As chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, there is no question in my mind that we must act on this bill prior to the recess.

In summary, this bill provides \$3.04 billion in new funding for the Department of Defense, and \$28.3 million for the Coast Guard, to pay for these contingency operations, and other emergency requirements.

For DOD, in addition to the contingency operations amounts, \$258 million is included to meet the increases in overseas personnel costs due to the decline in value of the dollar.

These amounts go directly to the men and women, and their families, stationed overseas, to defray the increased expenses they face because of this devaluation.

All new Defense spending in the bill is offset by rescission to DOD, defense related and foreign aid appropriations.

From available DOD funds, \$2.26 billion is rescinded. Also, \$200 million from function 050 nuclear facility funds, \$100 million from military construction funds, and \$120 million from foreign aid appropriations.

The conferees worked to ensure that no significant military program was damaged by these cuts. Most reductions come from savings in programs underway, or from reduced efforts in lower priority programs.

Some of these funds will need to be replaced in 1996, but will not reduce military readiness or capability this year.

The amount rescinded from DOD represents an increase of \$300 million over the levels adopted by the Senate.

These reductions were necessary to ensure that these new appropriations did not increase the deficit, thus hampering our ability to provide needed funds for 1996.

All the military services have identified the severe cuts in training and readiness that will result if this bill is not enacted early this month.

Navy fleet steaming days will be reduced. Flight training will be reduced. Ships will not undergo needed overhauls at shipyards, resulting in substantial layoffs.

Air Force flight training will be slashed by 25 percent. Aircraft will be parked on the ramp, because they will not receive necessary depot maintenance.

In short, we face a return to the hollow force that many of us remember from the 1970's. We cannot permit this.

In the 1970's, that hollow force was the result of the Congress not appropriating the funds needed for military readiness. This crisis is the result of the President diverting the funds provided by Congress for the military.

Let me make clear, the 1995 Defense appropriations bill provided the funds

needed to maintain military readiness and training for 1995.

During the last quarter of 1994, and the first quarter of 1995, the President used these funds to undertake the overseas missions in Kuwait, Korea, Bosnia, Iraq, Somalia, Cuba, and Haiti.

In no case did the President come to the Congress, to seek approval, and funding, for these missions.

The result was a \$2.5 billion diversion of readiness and personnel appropriations.

I want the Senate to know that the appropriations committees of the House and Senate were unanimous in their commitment that this circumstance should not happen again.

Included in the statement of the managers on the conference report is an explicit statement of our objections to the course followed by the administration. This bipartisan, bicameral statement reflects our views. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTINGENCY AND NONTRADITIONAL MISSIONS

The conferees express their deep concern over the process by which U.S. military forces are being deployed on major, large scale contingency operations. The conferees note that the Administration neither sought nor received advance approval of or funding for military operations from the Congress in support of peacekeeping and humanitarian missions. The missions involving Somalia, Rwanda, Haiti, and refugee relief in the Caribbean all mark significant departures from previous emergency deployments of American forces dealing with valid threats to the national security. The conferees strongly believe that military deployments in support of peacekeeping or humanitarian objectives both merit and require advance approval by the Congress.

This issue is of special concern to the conferees because of the effect these operations have had on the defense budgeting and planning process. There is no question but that the recent spate of "contingency" deployments, none of which was approved in advance by Congress nor budgeted for, have wreaked havoc upon the ability of the Department of Defense to maintain military readiness. These operations have led to substantial and repeated diversions of funds intended for training, equipment and property maintenance. From the Secretary of Defense to commanders in the field, there is universal acknowledgment that this practice has led to degradations in readiness.

A related issue involves the rapid increase in Defense Department participation in activities which under both law and tradition are the responsibility of other Federal departments. The principal example of this trend is the use of DoD funds, personnel, and facilities to deal with the issue of Cuban and Haitian refugees. The cost of these operations has been almost entirely borne by the Department of Defense, even though other Federal entities have long had primary responsibility for dealing with refugee and immigration issues and have, in the past, reimbursed the Department of Defense for such support in accordance with the Economy Act. At present, DoD is being forced to bear \$1 million per day in costs for these operations, out of funds intended to be used for